Remarks

In this response, claims 27, 31, 37, 40, 42, and 43 have been amended, and claims 46-48 have been added. Support for these amendments and additions is found throughout the originally filed specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 3-6, 10, 11, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 35, 37, 38, 40-43, and 45-48 are pending.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner for courtesies extended through interview with undersigned representative on October 2, 2009. In said Interview, points of distinction between the pending claims and the asserted art were discussed. Furthermore, possible amendments to the claims to further distinguish the claims were also discussed. Amendments based on these discussions are presented herein and the points of distinction are further discussed below.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 3, 6, 10-11, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 35, 37-38, 40-43, and 45 were rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,622) (hereinafter "Blinn") in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,047) (hereinafter "Wolff"), in view of Bezos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141) (hereinafter "Bezos") and further in view of Tobin (US 2001/0007991). The Applicants traverse these rejections.

Claim 27 recites an apparatus for the provisioning of information pages comprising:

> a storage device having stored therein a plurality of executable instructions that implements an information server, when contacted by a client device using a uniform resource locator (URL) comprising a server

name of the information server immediately followed by a separator immediately followed by a pseudo resource identifier nominally identifying a resource of the information server in accordance with a URL standard, the information server interprets a first portion of the pseudo resource identifier as a product identifier identifying a product and a second portion of the pseudo resource identifier as a marketing code identifying a type of media used to disseminate the URL, the type of media being a radio medium, a television medium, or a print medium, and in response, constructs and issues one or more queries including the product identifier to retrieve information corresponding to the identified product; dynamically generates instructions to create an associated information page for the identified product for provisioning to the client device, with at least a portion of information presented in the associated information page refers to the type of media, and maintains statistics for the marketing code; and

at least one processor coupled to the storage device to execute the stored executable instructions.

Claim 27 has been amended to recite "a marketing code identifying a type of media used to disseminate the URL, the type of media being a radio medium, a television medium, or a print medium." In the previous rejection of claim 27, and as further explained in the Interview, the Examiner relied upon the teaching of Bezos in which a resource identifier within the URL identified a sales associate. The Examiner stated that because Table 1 of Applicants' specification taught an example of a marketing code designating a marketing source as a particular sale's agent, the claim recitation "marketing code identifying a type of media used to disseminate the URL" was anticipated by this teaching of Bezos. While the Applicants do not agree that a sales associate could be interpreted as a "type of media," they have, by present amendment, further described that the type of media is a radio, television, or print medium. Accordingly, it is clear that the marketing code identifying a radio medium, a television medium, or a print medium as the type of media used to disseminate the URL, as recited in claim 27, is not taught or suggested by the resource identifier identifying a sales associate.

While Bezos also teaches that the resource identifier may be used to identify a catalog of documents (i.e., the associate's store), this still does not teach or suggest the

above recitation of claim 27 for at least the reason that identifying a collection of information does not identify the type of medium used to disseminate the collection. Said another way, identification of the store, simply identifies the collection of information and is generic to how the collection is conveyed to the recipient. In fact, Bezos' teachings clearly contemplate that the store may be distributed through both hypertextual and non-hypertextual distribution manners; however, the URL will be the same across both distribution manners. Bezos, column 8, lines 42-48 and column 9, lines 1-5. Thus, the resource identifier in the URL only identifies the associate's store (or the associate), it does not provide any further information as to how the URL was communicated to a particular recipient.

Claim 27 provides the ability to disseminate a URL, which may be easy enough for a recipient to remember, through any of a number of distribution channels and, when the recipient uses the URL, the information server may be capable of determining information about the particular distribution channel in which the URL was distributed. This ability is wholly absent from the individual or collective teachings of the cited art.

For at least these reasons, claim 27 is patentable over the asserted combination.

Claims 3, 6, 10-11, 23, 26-28, 31-33, 35, 38, 40-43 depend from, or include recitations similar to, claim 27. Accordingly, these claims are patentable over the asserted combination for at least reasons similar to those provided above with respect to claim 27. These claims include various additional points of patentability. For example, claim 37 recites that the type of media used to disseminate the URL is a television or radio medium. Bezos' identification of the catalog of documents (but not the dissemination method as discussed above) clearly is not germane to the radio or television media types as these media types are not used to disseminate documents.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn, Wolff, Bezos, and Tobin, as applied to independent claim 27 above, and further in view of Bijnagte (U.S. Patent 5,235,680) (hereinafter "Bijnagte"). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Claim 4 ultimately depends on claim 27. Bijnagte fails to correct the above-discussed deficiencies of the cited art with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, claim 4 is also patentable over this combination for at least similar reasons.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blinn et al., Wolff, Bezos, and Tobin as applied to independent claim 27 above, and further in view of Kirkevold et al (U.S. Patent 6,263,322) (hereinafter "Kirkvold").

Claim 5 ultimately depends on claim 27. Kirkvold fails to correct the above-discussed deficiencies of the cited art with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, claim 5 is also patentable over this combination for at least similar reasons.

Conclusion

For these reasons the Applicants believe the present claims are patentable over the cited references and, therefore, respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 10/23/09

/Nathan R. Maki/
Nathan R. Maki
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981